

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                     | FILING DATE        | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/690,099                          | 10/20/2003         | Michael L. Lemke     | 019411-000810US     | 3734             |  |
| 20350 7                             | 10/03/2005         |                      | EXAM                | INER             |  |
| TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP |                    |                      | NGUYEN              | NGUYEN, KIM T    |  |
| TWO EMBAR                           | CADERO CENTER      |                      |                     |                  |  |
| EIGHTH FLO                          | OR                 |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| SAN FRANCI                          | SCO, CA 94111-3834 | <b>,</b>             | 3713                |                  |  |

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Advisory Action                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief |  |

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |  |  |
|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/690,099      | LEMKE ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit     |  |  |
| Kim Nguyen      | 3713         |  |  |

|  | Kim Nguyen  | 3713   |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this commu   | nication appears on the cover sheet wi  | ith the correspondence add   | iress   |
| THE REPLY FILED 02 September 2005 FAILS T  | O PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN COND  | ITION FOR ALLOWANCE.   |   |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but this application, applicant must timely file or places the application in condition for allow a Request for Continued Examination (RCI time periods:  | ne of the following replies: (1) an amendr<br>vance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal  | ment, affidavit, or other evider<br>fee) in compliance with 37 C     | nce, which<br>CFR 41.31; or (3)               |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from   | the mailing date of the final rejection.  |  |   |
| no event, however, will the statutory period   | ing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from t   | he mailing date of the final reject                                  | tion.   |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTIO   |   |  |   |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.1 nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiraset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received be may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See SNOTICE OF APPEAL | the period of extension and the corresponding<br>tion date of the shortened statutory period for<br>by the Office later than three months after the m | amount of the fee. The appropure ply originally set in the final Off | riate extension fee<br>fice action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on   | A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41 37 i   | must be filed within two mont  | hs of the date of                             |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any repl  | a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.3  | 37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the                                    |   |
| AMENDMENTS   |   |  |   |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a   |   |  | ecause  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would red   | •   | see NOTE below);   |   |
| <ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (s</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the ap appeal; and/or</li> </ul>  | •   | erially reducing or simplifying                                      | the issues for                                |
| (d) They present additional claims without   |   | nally rejected claims.   |   |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116<br>4. The amendments are not in compliance wi  |   | Non-Compliant Amendment  | (PTOL-324)                                    |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the follow   |   | Non-compliant Amendment  | (1 101-324).                                  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s)  | •   | enarate timely filed amendm  | ent canceling the                             |
| non-allowable claim(s).  | would be allowable it subtritted it a se  | parate, unlery med amending  | citt carrooming are                           |
| For purposes of appeal, the proposed ame<br>how the new or amended claims would be<br>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as  | rejected is provided below or appended.   | o) 🛛 will be entered and an  | explanation of                                |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |   |  |   |
| Claim(s) objected to: <u>45,46 and 48</u> .<br>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10,23-32 and 47</u> .   |   |  |   |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-70,23-32 and 47.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |   |  |   |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  | <del></del>   |  |   |
| B.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a because applicant failed to provide a show was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.  | ring of good and sufficient reasons why th  |  |   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidences showing a good and sufficient reasons why</li> </ol>   | ence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections und<br>y it is necessary and was not earlier prese  | ler appeal and/or appellant fa<br>ented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)         | ails to provide a (1).                        |
| 10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered.<br>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  | . An explanation of the status of the claim   | s after entry is below or attac                                      | :hed.   |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been   | considered but does NOT place the appl  | ication in condition for allowa                                      | ance because:                                 |
| <br>12.  | Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449)   | Paper No(s)  |   |
| 13. ⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .   |   | •  |   |
| <del></del>  |   | Kim Nguyen   |   |
|  |   | Kim Nguyen   |   |

Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3713

Continuation of 13. Other: Claims 1 and 47 include "determining a regulatory function..." and claim 23 include "a regulatory module" that are not disclosed in the parent application 09/452,556 (U.S. patent 6,672,589). Therefore, the earliest filing date for claims 1, 23 and 47 is the filing date of the present application, which is on 10/20/03. The filing date of Scibetta' reference is 4/20/01 that is before the filing date of the present application, it is, therfore, applicable as reference in considering patentability of claims 1-10, 23-32 and 45-48.